

# NATIONAL MOTIFS ON A YOUNG WORLD CITIZEN'S LUGGAGE

Zoltán KALMÁR

**T**he present day reader, accustomed to Fülep's (the critic's) usual skepticism, while paying honor to him, can find out, in the *Preface* of the 1970 edition of *Hungarian Arts* (in a preface that is the author's undisguised, self-conceited introduction), that all of his written works were born by requests. The sage confesses to his readers that the essays published hereinwith do carry historical weight, at one time they exerted subversive influence upon the mentality of his contemporaries, and that they shook the intellectual foundations of the period. This rather self-adoring introduction claims nothing less than that it offers a passage to a kind of repository of some infinite wisdom. His essays, which had been published first in the *Hungarian Art*, were later published by the *Nyugat* (West) in 1918 and 1922, respectively, and then the same were separately published in an individual volume.<sup>1</sup> Already in the preface of the 1922 edition he had emphasized that the following pages would contain much more than one could discern after the first reading. He considers the 1923 edition as a fundamental document, as a lighthouse that would guide the readers through the vast seas of the philosophy of art.

Lajos Fülep's name invokes the image of the scholar art historian, the protestant minister delivering his regular sermon in a small village called Zengővárkony located in Baranya county, the exacting critic, and the professor of social sciences deeply committed to the science of Hungarology. He, however, started his professional career strictly from philosophical platforms, from the direction of the philosophy of arts, and he meticulously avoided the trenches of the fossilized academics and unremovable authorities.

He became imprisoned by the sight of the Greek-Roman culture of the Mediterranean, but his intellectual roots had stemmed from the northern culture, from the classical German idealism: his ethics is unambiguously inspired by Kant, whereas his philosophy of art reflects Hegel's influence. His peculiar art- and critical views are largely indebted to his Nietzsche-experience, whom – though he uncondi-

tionally admired and adored – he rejected from himself (he later found himself in the same situation with Csontváry's art).

The young Fülep, just like the 22-year-old Nietzsche, is the genius maverick of art criticism; he is the sensitive seismograph of the Hungarian intellectual world, who, with an adolescent's energy, undertakes to rearrange the domain of the philosophy of art, and shocks his contemporaries with his experiments aiming at rearranging the traditional value systems.

The young Nietzsche discovered the secrets and meaning of life in the arts: the works of arts should not be viewed only through the windows of the restorer's art studio but they should be viewed from a certain distance. What Nietzsche deduced from the tragedy, from the "mass culture" of the Greeks, was a system of the special harmonics of gestures, forms, movements, and music; and from the tragical, pre-Socrates period he heard the reverberations of the strange harmonics of life and art works, whereas the spiritual reality of Greek tragedies for him manifested itself in the strange medley of beauty and nervous agitation.

Fülep shared most of Nietzsche's views on Antiquity: "The age of Antiquity has to become our blood, has to merge into living energy and living values." The Greek art represented the same inspiring experience for him as for the novice German philosopher. Following Nietzsche's footsteps, Fülep removed the academic layer of the universal notion, peeled the popular from the national, and leaning on the arch between the classical Greek period and the contemporary Hungarian art he pointed out to the correlation between the universal and the national.

"Nietzsche's main concern was how to reconcile Greekness with pessimism. He, however, tried to explain, justify, and amend the world's pessimism and the Greeks exactly with the arts – as we saw it earlier, it was the arts that represented the key to the understanding of all cultures: consequently, for him, Greekness, pessimism, and the whole Greek culture manifested themselves as primarily esthetic issues. (...) the Greek world is directed, kept alive and supported by two gods, Dionysos and Apollo, the symbols of will and serene observer. (...) It is in their companies that Nietzsche sets out to resolve the problems of the Greeks, of the Greek culture. and the Greek tragedy. (...) Apollo's world, the world of the beautiful images, makes us forget the eternal suffering, redeems us from the eternal existence. Under Apollo's spell man forgets about the incessant works of will, about the unceasing killing, and looks at the passing phenomenon as something everlasting, and thus he yearns for it gazing at it with happiness. In this sort of artistic plasticity Apollo redeems the individual from his sufferings with the eternal illusions of the present. Thus Apollo himself becomes the symbol of an individual's ability to stand on his own, of his permanence, timelessness, and significance; Apollo is the individual's principle – principium individuationis –, the symbol of the illusion, the joy of the illusion of the individual existence. The other god of arts, Dionysos, is the opposite of the individual's principle represented by Apollo; he represents the break-up of this individuality, man again is in unison with

nature, and this unification creates an insofar unknown enchantment both in man and in nature. Man again feels himself one with the Original Cause, with the will of the world, with the universe, and with all of its joys and sufferings. (...) Both of these artistic forces eventually win over this pessimism: and Nietzsche's first attempt with this notion immediately surpasses Schopenhauer's and Wagner's. (...) The combination, the unison, and the alliance of these two artistic forces, – Apollo's and Dionysos'–, results in the birth of the Greek tragedy. (...) The development of the arts is closely intertwined with the race of these two artistic forces, the same way as the race of opposite sexes plays the crucial role in the history of mankind. They provided the life for the Greek man redeeming him from the pessimism, and they established an art form for him in the tragedy that further supplied him with a metaphysical consolation in the belief of an eternal existence. According to Nietzsche Greek art is born out of the fight between the forms of the appolonian simplicity, neat order, harmonious symmetry and magnificent view; and the fight with the dionysosian energy that radiates life into the smallest surfaces, penetrates into the minute details, both thus become entangled in an unbreakable bond. Fülep was very much influenced by this program aiming at the rearrangement of all values; Nietzsche did not advocate for stepping out of this value system towards some sort of nihilism, quite the contrary, he firmly committed himself to remain within this system. And though Fülep may have viewed Nietzsche's philosophical notion with a critical eye, namely, that the truth of arts will outgrow the truth of life, it seems as if we could hear the reverberations of the appolonian and dionysian principle of harmonics and sense the diminishing tension of contradictions echoed in Fülep's pair of notions of national-universal.

The young theoretician of arts and historian of ideas was primarily concerned with how art was ideologically determined, what the existential problems of the Hungarian art were and how to find its relevant place, and, last but not least, he searched for the possibilities that would eventually help it evolve into some form of universality. He poses only questions that are hypothetical only in nature and he analyzes and elaborates on them in such a manner that they irritate the pragmatic art historians.

The young theoretician regularly publishes in the columns of *Nyugat*, out of his place in Florence he edits one of the best, though short-lived, Hungarian magazines of his time, "*A Szellem*" (The Spirit). His educational background, which is firmly rooted in classical studies, enables him to appear with a sharp critical voice and participate in literary disputes, philosophical issues and to conduct behind-the-scenes analysis of the theatrical performances. His works are based on the traditions of the European art and philosophy that have already absorbed the past civilization's experiences, but, following Nietzsche's example, he distances himself from the custom of his age that tends to employ the techniques of historicity.

He spent several years in Italy, he stayed in Florence between 1907 and 1913, and there, at the Biblioteca Filosofica, he continued to polish his philosophical knowledge. His public readings, his lectures, and his comments all reveal the fact that

he is a dynamic free-thinker. The young art historian explores Italy and during his studies he adjusts and modifies his latin-based moderation that already and clearly manifest themselves in his early writings, first, in the "An Essay on Nietzsche," a long essay published in 1910, and then, what later provided the foundation for his doctoral dissertation, an essay – struggling with Croce's aesthetics – the "Memory in the Creation of Arts", published in 1912. While Croce interprets art creation along the axis of intuition, Fülep merges the arts into the processes of memory.

He started to work on the *Hungarian Art* (Magyar Művészet) in the middle of the World War I, about the same time that Pál Teleki, the geographer-politician, began to write (while he was out in the serbian battle-lines) his excellent essay, "History of the Geographical Thought," which was to become his academical inaugural lecture. Fülep's *Hungarian Art* has presented the readers with such an independent art philosophy and a philosophy of history that clearly reflect an individual thinker who is similar to his contemporary Martin Heidegger, who surprised the Nazi Germany with a unique book of aesthetics. Both authors analyze similar issues: the object of arts, the relationship between artist and art (history of art), the notions of national and universal, and the notion of mission in the arts; both measure them up to the Greek arts and philosophy, and both are backed in their writings by Hegel's aesthetics.<sup>4</sup>

The avantgarde, which is building up its strength during the First World War, tries to undertake to clarify the notions of arts and philosophy right in front of the background walls of constructivism. It poses its basic questions like this: when is a nation's art in complete synchronization with the universal measures?, when does the national carry the notion of the universal?, how does the national art become universally significant?, can philosophy, religion or art be national in their capacities at all?, how could the message of a culture – that is always being conveyed by individuals – be national or universal? The inner core of his writings is about the Hungarian art, seizing the notion of the national art, the potentials to define and to describe the national, to find the artistic mission of a nation, and the presence of a national value in the universal; and he always focuses on the historicity of the arts, on the substance and form and on about the relationship between the ethnical and the composition.

He approaches these issues from the point of view of art philosophy and the history of philosophy. He unambiguously declares his interpretation of these notions: art is nothing but the form, and the content of the art is philosophy. "The content of the art is exactly that "form", i.e., the part that merged into art (this form inhibits not only the question of "how" – a question much posed and less understood –, but the question of "what" – a question also much phrased and equally misunderstood –). (...) One who sees on one side the "form" and sees the "content" on the other, and sees in one the artistic value and sees the "philosophy" in the other, that individual can see art nowhere. That is the indisputable privilege of the dilettantes. The autonomy of the art does not mean that in it there is "only art" (some empty artistic notion), but it means that everything there is in it (religion, metaphysics, ethics, etc.)

must go through a metamorphosis to become art and must speak in the irreplaceable language of the art.”<sup>5</sup>

Fülep also considers it important to articulate his investigating perspectives in advance: all essential philosophy of art contemplation (or as he prefers to call it: “philosophy of art history”)<sup>6</sup> emerges out from a firm bedding of a definite concept, and our questions are posed in such a way as to what we consider essential and significant. He does not wear rubber soles: he openly assumes responsibility for addressing the arts with concrete preconditions, in a subjective way, and that he would undertake his approach based on pre-constructed ideas, thoughts, and from the grounds of the “established ideology.” He resembles to the artist who swings his chisel towards the marble, but before the first hammer-stroke touches upon it, he can see the exact sculpture. “You can bring home one or two things from your journey – says Kosztolányi – provided they are with you and within you when you get on the train in the first place.” The scholar researcher openly declares that his background is a thick metaphysical one, that is how he tries to define, interpret, and – choosing an exclusive private platform – he gets involved in a dialogue with the art no longer being concerned to measure up to the requirements of philological exactness and authenticity demanded by the professional historian, who, exactly because of these expectations, is unable to address the issues relating to the meaning of life and arts. In his goals he does not hide under a bushel the fact that in his own modest ways he aims at accomplishing the same achievements that Hegel did in his philosophy of history. The young theoretician considers Hegel to be his true paragon, who wrote as if he knew everything about this cursed world. Following Hegel’s example, Fülep shares the notion that the self-forming nature is not history’s part; he separates clearly the art objects from the natural objects, the art from nature, and the world of nature from the world of history. “Nature and art coexist as two separate worlds: the first is the world of being and time, the second is the world of existence and eternity.”<sup>7</sup>

Analyzing the roots of art Fülep speaks about the multitudinously *paradoxical* nature of the art work. While an individual artistic epoch and individual art work are in themselves closed, finished, saturated and absolute, they eventually merge into the immense flow of art wherefrom they obtain their final radiance. Art feeds itself from the products of various nations becoming a continually expanding river, that, however, is not continuous but that is divided into artistic epochs, thus it becomes historic. Art is both closed and open, permanent and temporary, real and ideal. “And I immediately point out to these two basic notions: “*the community of arts and the continuity of arts.*” Community, apart from the multitudes of nations, and continuity, apart from the division into epochs.”<sup>8</sup>

Artistic value grows out from the historic foundations of art, from the enclosed time-prison; and art fits well along the time line and fits into the masses of communities. The destiny of art is inseparable from the destiny of human communities. Referring to the importance of memory and historic consciousness, Fülep underlines

his point: "art, without a community, is a mere juxtaposition of works of art; the absence of correlation between time and eternity results in a history comprised of consecutive events."<sup>9</sup> Fülep, using Hegel's particular ontological notions, proclaims that existence, form and art are the same: the dialectical movements of being and existence that can shed light on the historic nature of the eternal art and on the universal characteristics of a national art.

According to Fülep the standard of art is the art of the Greeks; the Greek genius becomes the compulsory intellectual place of pilgrimage for all later artistic generations. He considers the Greek art to be the most universal one, where *the art* manifests itself as an undivided unity, where one can find answers not only for the question of what art is, but how come *there* is art at all. The Greeks had been characterized as the "ideal" or the "classical", Fülep, however, speaks about the Greek art as the most universal, the one that carries most explicitly the notion of historic continuity.

Fülep not only repeats the ancient recognition that the human body occupies the center place in Greek art, but that the Greek philosophy itself is anthropological and they firmly believed in human values as well. He carries the notion further represented not by his contemporaries but that of the Greek sages in illustrating how in the Homeric Greek world gods and humans mingle; Pindaros sang about the one mother who had given birth to both gods and humans, whereas Plato conducted his discourse on how humans resemble to gods and how human share characteristics of their gods.

The Greek nature of the art object, its embeddiment in the Hellenic ground should radiate through the absolute nature of the art work. The Greeks have formed all their Greekness into their arts, planted everything that was common characteristics in them, and what they thought to be expressed as their Greekness.

The Greek world has two major characteristics: one is the national myth introducing the timeless world of the idea, the levitation of the abstract spirit over the concrete reality; and the national athletics that illustrates the materially dramatic nature of the human body. Between these two worlds – following Hegel's ontology – he advocates for reconciliation, for the free passing through between the two, and thus he is able to establish the athlete god and the divine athlete. Myth provides the opportunity that the idea can manifest itself in a bodily manner, and the toned body allows itself to take the center stage in the realm of perfect beauty. The athletics gives the opportunity for the divine to appear in an individual body worthy of its greatness, that myth can obtain its reality, and that the gods can be shaped into human forms. The Greek art radiates not only a celestial experience, an elevated beauty, but beams forcefully an elementary force, and explosive energy as well. The unification of thought and sight and the portrayal of the gods and the athletes merging into one makes it possible that the Greek art can break the fixed dualist system of the Platonic philosophy, "as the manifestation of the absolute idea in the myth penetrates into the national and the god becomes the eternal athlete; and the bodily form defined in the national will rise into the general and the eternal, and the Greek athlete becomes the god."<sup>10</sup>

Universal art is the accomplished art characterized by the combination of the subtle moderation, the simplicity and permanence of forms, and the perfect *unity*. It is comprised of the temporary and the permanent, the ideal and the singular, the decaying and the eternal, the general and the abstract, the real life and the myth, and physics and metaphysics. The universal is always the product of the contemplating man, of the mind capable of synthesis. One can find no silent surfaces on its objects, because the artist can successfully incorporate into the work the harmonious unity of craft and beauty, imagination and artistic scale, and the balance of the spirited and the comforting. He each time attempts to completely renew the arts: the masterpiece or the chef-d'oeuvre will come to life exactly at the intersection of traditions and new trends and will retain new meanings that would transcend beyond itself.

Fülep in of his most well-known essays (analyzing Cezanne's art) wrote about a turning point of a "Copernicus magnitude" in the art of paintings attributed to the isolated – working in a Nietzsche-like solitude – French painter, and who had chosen a separate but parallel path to impressionism and naturalism, considering Cezanne as one of the most outstanding artists of the modern art. "Cezanne's still lifes resemble to the Greek athletes that are like the Gods" – writes in the closing passage of his famous essay in 1914 writing about Donatello's style.

Fülep, acknowledging the significance the impressionism, turns critically to Cezanne, but the Hungarian art that he had illustrated as universal in nature moved into a different direction not following that path outlined by Cezanne's aesthetics. He deals with the issues of the philosophy of art within a monographic framework: while he investigates the basic theoretical problems of the arts he presents us with three monographs. He tries to compare the 19th c. Hungarian artists with the Greeks attempting to bring divergent examples of the Hungarian art illustrating the relationship between national and universal: architecture represented by Ödön Lechner, sculpture represented by Miklós Izsó, and painting represented by József Rippl-Rónai. He attempts to reach conclusion based on these totally different, totally unrelated artists and their sovereign art forms. They are the ones who – through their arts – have been able to elevate the Hungarian art into universal levels, the ones who have been able to seize the universal in the national. Fülep finds the mission of the Hungarian art in them: *Lechner*, whom he compares with Gaudi, who works in the age of secession, but who separates himself from it; *Izsó*, who placed the "correlation" of the pants and the khiton under a magnifying glass (and to whom Fülep later dedicated another important essay acknowledging Izso's role – as a sort of epilogue in the development of *Hungarian Art* on the academical level); *Rippl-Rónai*, whose artistry was already greatly praised by Endre Ady in the middle of the last decade of the 19th century.

That there is an essential correlation between national and universal is Fülep's central notion and he supports his analysis by placing it into the crystal-clear Hegelian system of philosophy of history. He declares that at different points of time in history different nations play the role of the chosen ones in the history of the arts

achieving leading significance for a certain period of time directing, defining and digging out the trenches of arts, then they – leaving the empty marks of their spiritualism for our admiration and enthusiasm – will disappear in the dense fog of past. The unique and the universal, the national and the general will first in the history appear hand in hand in the antiquity with the Greek art, and it becomes obvious here that the unity of the arts and the unity of a nation are inseparable.

“The artistic mission of a nation is addressed to some formal issue, and this mission is national exactly because this specific problem is addressed to this nation. (...) *What is national: this singular form or the unique national-ethnical element through this form is manifested as universal at the great university of art and within its totality it becomes the unique mission.* (...) There is a period in the history of arts in which a nation creates *universal art*, namely, the universal art will grow out as an extension; or the other way round: universal art is a single nation's art. That is why it is the most universal. (...) The Greek art in its smallness and in its intensity is equivalent to the universal art in its greatness and in its extension. It is not only symbolically and ideally universal, but it is in its historical realization, in its validity and in its influence. Even what is beyond it will eventually become a common heritage of the arts of the European nations, it will become an integral part of the European community and universality. The pre-Greek arts of the pre-Hellenic nations of the East (Egypt, Assyria, etc.) enter through the Greeks into that community that we always talk about: the European. (...) The formula of the European culture is like a reversed pyramid, which at its apex, stands upon the Greeks, and the plain ground emerges upwards and widening.”<sup>11</sup> According to Fülep, all later nations would go through the same road leading to the Greek arts of this prime manifestation of universality. Any nation at any epoch can act as a mirror looking at itself through the Greeks, and each has the same chance to reach that universality. In this sense the European art manifests itself as both permanent and continuous, constant and progressing, as well as eternal and historic. But gathering strength from the sources of the past represents a pivotal change, too: it represents the peculiar juxtaposition of history and present. “What was once discovered, or a problem that was once resolved would not get lost; each epoch and each artist would continue where his predecessor left it off. His eternal contributions can only manifest themselves by having had predecessors and by having successors. This is the correlation of time and eternity, of being and existence, and the end result is history. The history of art is not a mere coincidence of singular events or isolated accidents that could be mixed up randomly: its history passes through substances, and these are its problems.”<sup>12</sup>

Fülep declares: the art object is a closed entity, it is what it is in itself, but it always carries all of its antecedents. Its totality hides the process of its own birth: as an end product it contains its genesis as well. The universal art contains such a synthesis where the tangible and the spiritual aspects are alloyed. Hegel, in the preface of *Phenomenology of Mind*, points out to this problem as one of the central issues of



his work: "the matter does not exhaust itself in its *purpose*, but in its *execution*; the *result* is not the *complete totality*, but the result can appear only together with the process of accomplishment."<sup>13</sup>

The significance of an art work does not depend on its recognition, its discovery or the influence it exerts. He provides several examples to illustrate his point: the paintings of Van Gogh nowadays are the most sought-after ones at the art auctions, whereas during his life he was in complete obscurity; or Fülep's favorite, Cezanne, was only discovered at the moment of his death. We can boldly state that the truths of the world of mathematics do not stem from the facts that we know them or that we use them. Each science has its own history, thus the science of mathematics is also of historic nature. The science of mathematics also has its own universal giants, who belong to a greater community conveying the great mysteries of mathematics for us, but when we deal with the science itself we do not pay attention to the history of it, but to the truths defined by the "chosen" ones.

Fülep does not wish to place into the limelight the national character for the sake of itself. He declares that each nation is different, unique and peculiar; and that there is no common horizon where their arts can be compared, evaluated or assessed. He rejects the traditional approaches of mass psychology or the overtones of nationalistic sentiments, and he cannot even interpret the notions of the "racist" artistic views.

"The artistic form, by nature, is universal or it strives to be (...) If art does contain national, then it has to be the *form*, because everything else, mood, temperament, climate, environment etc., though they belong to the arts the same way as the ethnical material does, they do not yet constitute art."<sup>14</sup> National art does not become national art because of its popular characters, or its themes or its system of motifs; but it becomes art through its characteristic style, through the peculiar composition and through its autonomous form. An object of art cannot be considered as valuable in itself simply because it has been created by Hungarian artists or because it has been created in Hungary. Very often it stands too far from us to consciously differentiate between what artistic is, and what national is. Fülep views the Hungarian art with a critical eye, sometimes he is cynical and sarcastic. National art is not assessed on the basis of national characteristics. He measures up all art works only to one criterion: quality. In his 1906 essay, he lashes out against that sort of mentality that stands blindfolded in the cryptic silence of the great pantheon of the Hungarian art trying to enjoy beauty.

"Have you ever visited the archives of the National Museum? And have you ever seen the sarcophagi that are full of masses of colourless and pale sheets and letters of the alphabet? Hungarian literature is buried in this big yellow building. And it will never come out. All are there who, in our age, have excelled in orthography. And, even those are there, who have not. And the ones who have mastered it can rest in a fancy sarcophagus. Our Hungarians could not learn two things in a thousand years: to write and to write in Hungarian. The porter of the Louvre is more intelligent than

most of our ministers. The greatest merit of our great writers, who are – with dead certainty – forever immortalized, like Mikes, is that they could well use the language. The grateful nation will always keep the memory of such queer fish. In the land of great talents, where style is identified with Béla Tóth, it is very rare that a sentence is born out of art. Our old literature is comprised of literary remains, Tinódy, Gyöngyösi, Zrinyi, and the great figure of prose, Gábor Pesti Mízsér. (...) I have read very erudite individuals who have mastered the Greek and Latin style: Dávid Baróti Szabó, Benedek Virágh, András Dugonics, Gvadányi, and I have come to realize that even Kazinczy – who is the most literate among them – lacks the style that a Japanese haiku has or what one can see in the pinky toe of a Greek sculpture.”<sup>15</sup>

Fülep cannot emphasize enough that rhetorical art is not art. An art object might be fancy and resounding, it can feed itself from the language and the oldest tradition of the nation – but it can only have stamina if it does not collapse under the burden of the criteria system of the universal art. Hungarian art can be Hungarian only if it is universal at the same time; the one that is not born out of as universal is worthless to be Hungarian as well. National art is not constant but constantly changing, it is a continually forming formation; it is a process during which the non-national components, motifs are also absorbed, integrated and built in the national works of art.

## Quotations

<sup>1</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Hungarian Art*, Budapest, Corvina Publishing House, 1971, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Frigyes Nietzsche*. In: Lajos Kőszegi (ed.): *Nietzsche Archive. Selections from the Hungarian Nietzsche-Literature up to 1956*. Veszprém, Comiratus, 1996., pp. 193–195.

<sup>3</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Memory in the Creation of Arts*. In: *From the Revolution of the Art to the Great Revolution II*, Budapest, Magvető Publishing House, 1974, pp. 605–652.

<sup>4</sup> To compare Fülep's and Heidegger's philosophy of art requires a separate essay.

<sup>5</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Hungarian Art*. Budapest, Corvina Publishing House, 1971., pp. 18–19.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23

<sup>7</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Memory in the Creation of Arts*. In: *From the Revolution of the Art to the Great Revolution II*, Budapest, Magvető Publishing House, 1974, p. 648

<sup>8</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Hungarian Art*. Budapest, Corvina Publishing House, 1971., p. 24

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 28–31

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 34–35

<sup>13</sup> G. W. F. Hegel: *Phenomenology of Mind*. Budapest, Akadémia Publishing House, 1979, p. 10

<sup>14</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Hungarian Art*. Budapest, Corvina Publishing House, 1971., p. 27

<sup>15</sup> Lajos Fülep: *Collected Works I., Articles, Essays 1902–1908.*, Budapest, 1988 pp. 275–276.